



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,733	11/21/2001	Gregory D. Johnson	13190.101	9460

24283 7590 01/12/2006

PATTON BOGGS  
1660 LINCOLN ST  
SUITE 2050  
DENVER, CO 80264

EXAMINER

AUGHENBAUGH, WALTER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1772

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/993,733	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JOHNSON, GREGORY D.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Walter B. Aughenbaugh	<b>Art Unit</b> 1772	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-20, 22-28 and 39-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-20, 22-28 and 39-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 43 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/21/02</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The finality of the previous Office Action mailed January 26, 2005 has been vacated.
2. The prosecution of application serial number 09/993,733 has been reopened.
3. To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below.

### ***Specification***

4. The amendment filed April 14, 2003 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the recitation "wherein said foam plastic is 32% or more gas, by volume" of claim 39, which was added in the amendment filed April 14, 2003. See 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 39 made of record below.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

***Claim Objections***

5. Claim 43 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The recitation “wherein said foam plastic is 32% or more gas, by volume” of claim 39, which was added in the amendment filed April 14, 2003, constitutes new matter. Applicant has not provided support for this recitation in the specification as originally filed. The statement in the specification that “[t]he foam may be from 10% to 70% gas by volume” (page 2, lines 14-15) does not provide support for the recitation “wherein said foam plastic is 32% or more gas, by volume” because this statement does not establish the percentage 32% as a minimum value that Applicant had possession of (i.e. that Applicant contemplated) at the time the application was filed. The specification as originally filed does not provide 32% as a possible minimum value. Applicant’s statement on page 8 of the amendment filed April 14, 2003 that “the volume

Art Unit: 1772

percentage of the gas has been placed at 32% to be sure it is well outside the range Sobolev” indicates that Applicant did not “place” [choose] this value based on Applicant’s specification as originally filed but on Sobolev’s disclosure in an effort to overcome the rejection of record. However, since there is no support for this limitation in Applicant’s specification as originally filed, this limitation constitutes new matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. Claims 1-12, 14-17, 22 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobolev in view of Fitzgerald et al.

In regard to claims 1 and 5, Sobolev teaches a laminate comprising two metal sheets and a plastic core between and bonded to the metal sheets (col. 36, lines 8-12). Sobolev teaches that the metal sheets are steel (col. 9, lines 27-50 and col. 19, lines 47-50). Sobolev teaches that the laminate is used as panels for concrete pouring forms (col. 3, lines 21-25 and line 60). Sobolev teaches that the total thickness of the laminate is less than 2 inches (50.8 mm) (col. 36, lines 10-14); therefore, Sobolev teaches a panel thickness of greater than 7 mm.

Sobolev fails to teach that the plastic of the plastic core is high-density polyethylene.

Fitzgerald et al., however, disclose that high-density polyethylene is a plastic that has a suitable rigidity for use in concrete form mold panels (col. 2, lines 10-12 and col. 3, lines 4-15). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have used high-density polyethylene as the plastic of the plastic core of Sobolev since high-density polyethylene is a plastic that is notoriously well known as having a suitable rigidity for use in concrete form mold panels as taught by Fitzgerald et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used high-density polyethylene as the plastic of the plastic core of Sobolev since high-density polyethylene is a plastic that is notoriously well known as having a suitable rigidity for use in concrete form mold panels as taught by Fitzgerald et al.

In regard to claims 2 and 3, Sobolev teaches a panel thickness range of 9-15 mm (claim 2) or a panel thickness value of 12 mm (claim 3) (col. 36, lines 10-14).

In regard to claim 4, Sobolev teaches that the weight of the laminate is less than about 3.5 lb./ft.<sup>2</sup> (col. 4, lines 46-47). Claim 4 as amended requires that the panel weigh less than 77 lb./(8ft.\*2ft.), equivalently 77 lb./16ft.<sup>2</sup>, equivalently about 4.8 lb./ft.<sup>2</sup>. Sobolev therefore teaches that the panel has a density such that a panel that is 8 feet by 2 feet weighs 77 pounds or less, i.e. that the panel weighs less than about 4.8 lb./ft.<sup>2</sup>.

In regard to claims 6-8, Sobolev teaches that "each metal sheet has a thickness between about 0.015 inch and about 0.1 inch" (col. 36, lines 10-11). In regard to the metal layer thickness for one of the facing or backing layers of 0.009 inch claimed in claim 6 or the metal layer thickness for one of the facing or backing layers of 0.013 inch claimed in claim 7, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have varied the thickness of one of the facing or backing layers of Sobolev via routine experimentation, such that the thickness of one of the facing or backing layers is less than "about 0.015 inch" as specified by Sobolev as the lower end of the thickness range, in order to achieve the optimal balance of panel rigidity and minimization of metal material used depending on the particular desired end use and the required panel rigidity for the particular desired end use, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill

Art Unit: 1772

in the art in the absence of unexpected results. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In further regard to claim 7, it is Examiner's position that 0.013 inches is "about 0.015 inch" as specified by Sobolev as the lower end of the thickness range. In regard to claim 8, the claimed thickness of "0.019 inch" falls within the bounds set by the thickness range taught by Sobolev.

In regard to claim 10, Sobolev teach that the plastic core is a foam (col. 4, lines 44-45 and col. 12, lines 3-38).

In regard to claims 11 and 12, Sobolev teach that a filler is used in the plastic (resin) core layer of the panel to lower the density of the core and that the filler is a foaming agent or blowing agent conventionally used to foam various resins as known by those skilled in the art or glass microballoon filler having an average diameter of from about 20 microns to about 12 mm (col. 12, lines 3-16). Sobolev teaches that for lower density cores and lighter weight laminates, the microballoons and foaming agents are the preferred density lowering agents. Sobolev teach that the specific gravity of the resin core, which is equivalent to the density of the core layer, should be set in a range from about 0.8 to about 1.3. Sobolev teaches the variation of the density of the core layer via routine experimentation via control of the volume of gas per unit volume of the core layer via use of glass microballoons of a given size or of foaming agents conventionally used to foam resins known by those skilled in the art. It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have varied the size of the microballoon filler, and therefore the "gas by volume" value of the foam plastic, or to have experimented with different foaming agents and different amounts of a given foaming agent as known by those of ordinary skilled in the art as taught by Sobolev, via routine experimentation in

Art Unit: 1772

order to achieve the optimal “gas by volume” amount as claimed by Applicants, i.e. volume of gas per unit volume of the core layer expressed as a percentage, that achieves the desired laminate weight depending on the desired end result as taught by Sobolev, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art in the absence of unexpected results. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

In regard to claims 14-17, Sobolev fails to teach that the panel is bent to form a flange (as claimed in claim 14), that the flange has openings formed in it (as claimed in claim 15), that the panel is notched at the bend (as claimed in claim 16) or that the bend is a 90° bend (as claimed in claim 17). Fitzgerald et al., however, disclose a panel with V-shaped cross sections 20 and 22 (i.e. notches) where the panel is bent 90° to form a mold with side walls (i.e. flanges) 12 and 14 (col. 3, lines 9-29 and Figures 1, 2 and 6). Fitzgerald et al. disclose openings 42 and 44 formed in flange 12 and openings 46 and 48 formed in flange 14 for removable pins to assure maintaining the assembled state of the mold (col. 3, lines 53-60 and Figures 2 and 6). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have provided a 90° bend in the panel of Sobolev via a notch in order to form a flange and to further provide openings in the flange, since it is notoriously well known in the art to bend concrete form mold panels via a notch and to provide openings in the resulting flanges in order to assure maintaining the assembled state of the mold via pins as taught by Fitzgerald et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided a 90° bend in the panel of Sobolev via a notch in order to form a flange and to further provide openings in the flange, since it is notoriously well known in the art



Art Unit: 1772

to bend concrete form mold panels via a notch and to provide openings in the resulting flanges in order to assure maintaining the assembled state of the mold via pins as taught by Fitzgerald et al.

In regard to claim 22, Sobolev teaches that the facing has a recessed and a raised portion forming a design (see Fig. 8A, as can be seen most readily at the bottom left-hand corner of Fig. 8A- the metal facing layer is clearly contoured and there is therefore a recessed and a raised portion forming a design. The recitation that the design is “to be impressed in concrete” is an intended use limitation and has therefore been given little patentable weight. Concrete would nonetheless be impressed in the panel having a recessed and a raised portion forming a design shown in Figure 8A since Sobolev teaches that the panel is used as a concrete formwork panel (col. 3, lines 47-62).

In regard to claim 25, Sobolev teaches that the metal layers are bonded to the plastic core with an adhesive (col. 31, lines 39-40).

In regard to claim 26, Sobolev teaches that it is common to join several laminate panels to produce a larger continuous panel (col. 33, lines 23-25), and that conventional rivets or other types of mechanical fasteners are used to fasten the plurality of panels together (col. 33, lines 56-57).

In regard to claims 27 and 28, Sobolev teaches that the panels are fastened to a steel or aluminum frame (col. 2, lines 23-26 and col. 33, lines 66-68).

9. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobolev in view of Fitzgerald et al. and in further view of Toedter.

Sobolev and Fitzgerald et al. teach the concrete formwork panel as discussed in paragraph 16 of Paper 5. Fitzgerald et al. further teaches that the panel includes a panel end and is bent twice to form a first bend and a second bend (see Figures 1, 2 and 6).

Sobolev and Fitzgerald et al fail to teach that the second bend is closer to the panel end than the first bend and that the second bend is substantially 180° so that the panel is bent back on itself to form a double-thick flange.

Toedter, however, discloses a panel (work sheet, item 200) that is bent back on itself to form a double-thick panel (col. 3, lines 21-39 and Fig. 1, 8 and 10). Toedter discloses that the panel is bent back on itself via grooves (items 222 and 223), that are structurally equivalent to the grooves (items 20 and 22) of Fitzgerald et al., to form the second bend that is substantially 180° as claimed by Applicant (col. 3, line 41-col. 4, line 40) and to form the double-thick flange as claimed by Applicant. The structure taught by Toedter that is equivalent to the second bend claimed by Applicant is closer to the panel end (free edge surface, item 3252, Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 62-63) than the first bend that is made at grooves 220 and 221 as shown in Fig. 11. Toedter discloses that this panel structure results in a building element that has, weight for weight, a greater resistance to crush and shear exerting forces than other known building elements (col. 1, lines 47-65).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have formed the flange (items 12 or 14) of Fitzgerald et al. such that the second bend of the flange (item 12 or 14) is closer to the panel end than the first bend and such that the second bend is substantially 180° so that the panel is bent back on itself to form a double-thick flange since it is notoriously well known to form double-thick building elements with two bends wherein the second bend is closer

Art Unit: 1772

to the end of the building element than the first bend and the second bend is substantially 180° so that the element is bent back on itself to form a double-thick building element in order to enhance the resistance to crush and shear exerting forces of the building element as taught by Toedter.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed the flange (items 12 or 14) of Fitzgerald et al. such that the second bend of the flange (item 12 or 14) is closer to the panel end than the first bend and such that the second bend is substantially 180° so that the panel is bent back on itself to form a double-thick flange since it is notoriously well known to form double-thick building elements with two bends wherein the second bend is closer to the end of the building element than the first bend and the second bend is substantially 180° so that the element is bent back on itself to form a double-thick building element in order to enhance the resistance to crush and shear exerting forces of the building element as taught by Toedter.

10. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobolev in view of Fitzgerald et al. and in further view of Lee.

Sobolev and Fitzgerald et al. teach the concrete formwork panel as discussed above. Sobolev and Fitzgerald et al. fail to teach that the panel is bent into a hollow, columnar form (as claimed in claim 19) where the columnar form is cylindrical (as claimed in claim 20). Lee, however, teach a building panel in a form for building columns, where the core is cylindrical (col. 2, lines 60-65). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have bent the panel of Sobolev and Fitzgerald et al. into a hollow columnar form where the columnar

Art Unit: 1772

form is cylindrical, since it is notoriously well known to bend panels into columnar and cylindrical form in order to use the panels to build columns as taught by Lee.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have bent the panel of Sobolev and Fitzgerald et al. into a hollow columnar form where the columnar form is cylindrical, since it is notoriously well known to bend panels into columnar and cylindrical form in order to use the panels to build columns as taught by Lee.

11. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobolev in view of Fitzgerald et al. and in further view of Yoshida et al.

Sobolev and Fitzgerald et al. teach the concrete formwork panel as discussed above. Sobolev and Fitzgerald et al. fail to teach that the panel includes a strengthening rib attached to the metal backing layer. Yoshida et al., however, disclose a concrete formwork provided with a plurality of small ribs to strengthen the plate of the formwork (col. 2, lines 48-51). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have attached a strengthening rib to the metal backing layer of the panel of Sobolev and Fitzgerald et al. in order to strengthen the panel as taught by Yoshida et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have attached a strengthening rib to the metal backing layer of the panel of Sobolev and Fitzgerald et al. in order to strengthen the panel as taught by Yoshida et al.

12. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobolev in view of Fitzgerald et al. and in further view of Gallis et al.

Sobolev and Fitzgerald et al. teaches the concrete formwork panel as discussed above. Sobolev and Fitzgerald et al. fail to teach that the panel includes a strengthening rib attached to

Art Unit: 1772

the metal backing layer as claimed in claim 23 including a handhold as claimed in claim 24.

Gallis et al., however, disclose a concrete wall form assembly having two modular units, each of which consists of stiffening ribs 16a-c for the modular unit 11a and stiffening ribs 16d-f for modular unit 11b (col. 2, lines 41-51 and Figure 1). Gallis et al. disclose that modular units 11a and 11b are provided with a pair of handles 19 which facilitates lifting of the complete unit during erection and dismantling, and that the handles 19 are fixed to the second and sixth ribs of each unit (col. 2, lines 62-67). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have attached a strengthening rib to the metal backing layer of the panel of Sobolev and Fitzgerald et al. in order to strengthen (i.e. stiffen) the panel as taught by Gallis et al., and to have provided a handhold such as the handles of Gallis et al. in order to facilitate lifting of the form assembly during erection and dismantling as taught by Gallis et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have attached a strengthening rib to the metal backing layer of the panel of Sobolev and Fitzgerald et al. in order to strengthen (i.e. stiffen) the panel as taught by Gallis et al., and to have provided a handhold such as the handles of Gallis et al. in order to facilitate lifting of the form assembly during erection and dismantling as taught by Gallis et al.

13. Claims 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobolev.

In regard to claim 39, Sobolev teaches a laminate comprising two metal sheets and a plastic core between and bonded to the metal sheets (col. 36, lines 8-12). Sobolev teaches that the laminate is used as panels for concrete pouring forms (col. 3, lines 21-25 and line 60).

Sobolev teaches that the plastic core is a foam (col. 4, lines 44-45 and col. 12, lines 3-38).

Sobolev fails to explicitly teach that the foam plastic is 32% or more gas, by volume (as claimed

Art Unit: 1772

in claim 39), or 40% or more gas, by volume (as claimed in claim 40) or 50% or more gas, by volume (as claimed in claim 41). However, Sobolev teach that a filler is used in the plastic (resin) core layer of the panel to lower the density of the core and that the filler is a foaming agent or blowing agent conventionally used to foam various resins as known by those skilled in the art or glass microballoon filler having an average diameter of from about 20 microns to about 12 mm (col. 12, lines 3-16). Sobolev teaches that for lower density cores and lighter weight laminates, the microballoons and foaming agents are the preferred density lowering agents. Sobolev teach that the specific gravity of the resin core, which is equivalent to the density of the core layer, should be set in a range from about 0.8 to about 1.3. Sobolev teaches the variation of the density of the core layer via routine experimentation via control of the volume of gas per unit volume of the core layer via use of glass microballoons of a given size or of foaming agents conventionally used to foam resins known by those skilled in the art. It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have varied the size of the microballoon filler, and therefore the "gas by volume" value of the foam plastic, or to have experimented with different foaming agents and different amounts of a given foaming agent as known by those of ordinary skilled in the art as taught by Sobolev, via routine experimentation in order to achieve the optimal "gas by volume" amount as claimed by Applicants, i.e. volume of gas per unit volume of the core layer expressed as a percentage, that achieves the desired laminate weight depending on the desired end result as taught by Sobolev, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art in the absence of unexpected results. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Art Unit: 1772

14. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobolev and in further view of Fitzgerald et al.

Sobolev teaches the concrete formwork panel as discussed above. Sobolev fails to teach that the plastic of the plastic core is high-density polyethylene. Fitzgerald et al., however, disclose that high-density polyethylene is a plastic that has a suitable rigidity for use in concrete form mold panels (col. 2, lines 10-12 and col. 3, lines 4-15). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have used high-density polyethylene as the plastic of the plastic core of Sobolev since high-density polyethylene is a plastic that is notoriously well known as having a suitable rigidity for use in concrete form mold panels as taught by Fitzgerald et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used high-density polyethylene as the plastic of the plastic core of Sobolev since high-density polyethylene is a plastic that is notoriously well known as having a suitable rigidity for use in concrete form mold panels as taught by Fitzgerald et al.

#### ***Conclusion***

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter B. Aughenbaugh whose telephone number is 571-272-1488. While the examiner sets his work schedule under the Increased Flexitime Policy, he can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:45am to 5:15pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is to 571-273-8300.


Art Unit: 1772

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Walter B. Aughenbaugh

01/06/06

WBA

  
HAROLD PYON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
1772

1/9/06